

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are currently pending in this application, of which claims 16-29 have been withdrawn from further consideration.

Claim Rejections

A) Claims 1-5, 13 and 15

On pages 2-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fujita (JP 2000-164322). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites an adjustment bending process bending the ground electrode in the widthwise direction. Claim 1 also recites that the widthwise direction is different than the direction of pressing the ground electrode towards the center electrode. The Examiner asserts that Fujita discloses bending in a widthwise direction. However, the Examiner's widthwise direction is in the direction of pressing the ground electrode towards the center electrode. This is clearly seen in the Examiner's explanation on page 3 of the Advisory Action dated March 13, 2006, wherein W2 is the ground electrode and W1 is the center electrode (*see* page 2 of the Final Office Action dated November 11, 2005). Since the Examiner's alleged widthwise direction is the same direction of pressing the ground electrode towards the center electrode, it cannot be the widthwise direction as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable over Fujita.

Claims 2-5 and 13 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable at least because of their dependency.

Claim 15 sets forth a method of performing adjustment bending of spark plugs in the width direction and that the width direction of the ground electrodes is different than a direction of the spark gap. As shown in the Examiner's explanation of the width of the electrode on page 3 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner's alleged width direction is the same direction as the spark gap. Fujita fails to teach adjustment bending in the width direction as set forth in claim 15.

B) Claim 6

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita. Claim 6 depends from claim 1. Even if, for the sake of argument alone, it would have been obvious to modify Fujita as suggested by the Examiner, Fujita would still be deficient with respect to claim 1, and thus dependent claim 6, for at least the reasons outlined above.

C) Claims 7-12 and 14

The Examiner rejects claims 7-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita in view of Nakatani, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,741,963). Claims 7-12 and 14 depend from claim 1. Even if one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified Fujita with Nakatani as suggested by the Examiner, the above noted deficiencies of Fujita with respect to claim 1 would not be corrected. Accordingly, claims 7-12 and 14 are allowable over the combination of Fujita and Nakatani at least by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, she is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below.

An RCE and a Petition for Extension of Time with appropriate fees accompany this document. The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all additional required fees (except the Issue/Publication Fees) to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen R. Valancius
Registration No. 57,574

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 17, 2006